

This conclusion results from an investigative mind set that imputes to those under investigation the worst, most venal motivations. Such a prejudice on the part of the Independent Counsel is unfair to those being investigated.

In her report the Independent Counsel failed to mention a number of factual matters that clearly would lead her to a different opinion about my conduct. She failed to mention that I proposed that the Democratic National Committee limit contributions by anyone to a total of \$2,000. She also failed to mention that during my tenure I advocated, in testimony before a congressional committee, campaign finance reforms that would have eliminated the large contributions which concern her.

Political parties have a responsibility to elected officials, to rank and file party members, and to the public to act responsibly and ethically. Part of that responsibility is to provide linkage among party members, government officials and the public. Certainly the party chair should play a role in this linkage. While National Chair of the Democratic National Committee, I did contact Administration officials on behalf of Democrats. To have done otherwise would have been a dereliction of my duties.

Clearly, the circumstances under which such contacts are made are important. It would be inappropriate for any party official to contact an Administration official to ask for special or favored treatment for a person or group solely because that person or group makes contributions to the party, or in exchange for a promised contribution. I did not make contacts under such circumstances. Yes, I made appropriate contacts asking for appropriate review of decisions that